Exhibit 6A

August 6, 2014 Hearing Transcript

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

IN RE: CITY OF DETROIT, Docket No. 13-53846

MICHIGAN,

Detroit, Michigan

August 6, 2014

9:00 a.m. Debtor.

HEARING RE. STATUS CONFERENCE RE. PLAN CONFIRMATION PROCESS (#6376) SIXTH AMENDED ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES, DEADLINES AND HEARING DATES RELATING TO THE DEBTOR'S PLAN OF ADJUSTMENT BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEVEN W. RHODES UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtor: Jones Day

By: HEATHER LENNOX 222 East 41st Street New York, NY 10017 (212) 326-3837

Jones Day

THOMAS CULLEN By: GREGORY SHUMAKER 51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20001

(202) 879-3939

For National Sidley Austin, LLP

Public Finance By: GUY NEAL

1501 K Street, N.W. Guarantee Corp.: Washington, DC 20005

(202) 736-8041

For Assured

Corp.:

Chadbourne & Parke, LLP Guaranty Municipal By: ROBERT SCHWINGER 30 Rockefeller Plaza New York, NY 10112

(212) 408-5364

For the Official Dentons US, LLP

Committee of Retirees:

By: SAM J. ALBERTS

1301 K Street, NW, Suite 600, East Tower

Washington, DC 20005

(202) 408-7004

have to be brought out virtually entirely through examination, whereas if the report is in evidence, I can just focus on the questions I have for her, so can we have an agreement to admit her report into evidence?

2.4

MR. CULLEN: No objection from the city, your Honor. I agree with the -- and I agree with the rationale that otherwise we'd go through a long process. The middle alternative is she could offer the report, say, "Is this your report? Do you still stand by it?" et cetera, and then we could do -- offer that into evidence on that basis, but I think having it into evidence to start with simplify the procedure a lot.

MR. HACKNEY: So, your Honor, regrettably, we don't share the view. We're not able at this time to stipulate either to her credentials or to the admission of her report, but what I did want to suggest today was that I thought to the extent you haven't already read her report -- I think it sounds like that you have read her report, that you had a copy of it.

THE COURT: Oh, yes.

MR. HACKNEY: Yes. I do think it would be useful for the Court to have read her report, as you have, and to read her deposition, and we don't have an objection with the Court reading her deposition. The transcript is available, and we can get it to you as soon as you'd like.

THE COURT: Um-hmm.

2.4

MR. HACKNEY: But we have questions about the admissibility of her opinion testimony that I think we're going to be raising with you, so I'm not able to stipulate to that, and I apologize. I understand it would be streamlined --

THE COURT: All right, but no apology necessary.

Okay. So that answers Question D, which is in regard to the stipulation to her qualifications as an expert; is that right? What were you going to say, sir? I'm sorry.

MR. SOTO: Your Honor, the same goes with respect to FGIC. We're considering some aspects of the report -- and, again, it's highlighted in the testimony that Mr. Hackney is referring to -- that may be portions of a motion in limine and maybe even some other motions. That's the reason why we agree.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CULLEN: Your Honor, if I may, Cullen, again, for the city. It is possible -- we would stipulate the report in, but it is possible if the Court is going to read the deposition on which the challenge to her qualifications and opinions might have rested and has already read the report, it might be -- it might be more expeditious if it can't be stipulated for the Court to just decide on that. It could be offered into evidence, and the Court could make a